

Comments/Questions Received on Tall Chief Conceptual Draft June/July 2014

Responses by Tall Chief Project Team

1. Comment: I see the summary numbers on wetland and buffer, but I didn't see described what the assumptions are around riparian buffer widths or other opportunities for wetland habitat enhancement. Given this is a topic of current discussion, I think it would be good to include the County's assumptions and rationale about buffer widths.

Answer: We assume that the successful proposer will comply with King County code on buffer requirements for agricultural lands, but we are not specifying buffers around the wetlands as part of the RFP process. A farm management plan can provide flexibility in regulatory buffer widths.

2. Comment: It is unclear how a decision will be reached around lease vs sale of the property. Clearly, the short lease term would be a disincentive for investment and would strongly shape the type of proposals received. As is, this seems to favor a sale scenario. If there is interest in more creative community-oriented uses, I think a stronger incentive should be provided for groups to invest in putting together a proposal. The strongest version would be for the County to go step-wise in a process to first decide whether a sale or lease is preferred, and then solicit proposals. Also, if creative, community-oriented proposals are truly desired, perhaps more time should be given for these to germinate.

Answer: The goal of the RFP is to solicit a range of proposals, and to evaluate them based on the desired outcomes identified in the RFP. There is not a bias toward sale or lease, but rather a desire to achieve the maximum amount of benefit from a community and agricultural perspective. We will base our decision on the "best" proposal from the perspective of providing a suite of community/resource benefits including returning the land to agricultural production in an ecologically and economically sustainable way, maximizing the economic potential of the existing structures and/or the area out of the floodway, ability to carry out the proposal, and creating vocational/educational/other community educational opportunities.

Please note that lessors can propose community partnerships that include non-profit organizations, other government entities (e.g. King Conservation District or municipalities), or King County. We will evaluate all proposals on the evaluation criteria, not on the return on investment to King County. With respect to the question of the adequacy of the amount of time for non-profits to build partnerships to make an effective proposal, we are extending the proposed deadline for submittals to early October. We believe this is an adequate amount of time for proposers to assemble a team to submit a responsive proposal.

3. Comment: I am curious if there have been any programmatic discussions with urban groups or jurisdictions about proposals focused on linking urban consumers with rural production – i.e. direct participation by farmers market organizations or to affordable produce programs. This is somewhat implied in the draft RFP, but perhaps it could be approached directly. Again, a longer process would allow for creative development of proposals.

Answer: King County has included non-profits and other groups linking urban consumers and rural producers in conversations about Tall Chief and other efforts to build those links. While we have not directly facilitated partnerships related to this RFP, we participate in a number of regional forums where general conversations about rural/urban and for-profit/non-profit/public sector linkages have been occurring. King County has a Farm City Roundtable, which has attracted participation from a range of urban and rural agricultural interests, and participated in the Local Food and Farm Roundtable, as well as the Regional Food Policy Council. We believe that sufficient linkages exist within the region for farmers, distributors, non-profits and jurisdictions to identify partners to assemble project teams and responses to this RFP.

4. Comment: I think it may be important to mention in the RFP that any landowner or tenant who would plan on participating in any USDA programs (with NRCS or FSA) would need to be in compliance with the Highly Erodible Land Conservation and Wetland Conservation Provisions of the Food Security Act of 1985.

The reason I bring that up is that currently the land is not in agriculture so if a producer came into me for cost share for some activity on the land, they would have to go through that compliance process. It does not cost anything but one of our wetland/HEL folks would have to make the determination and get them eligible for conservation programs.

Answer: We will post the NRCS information on the webpage for the RFP so that proposers know that if they are interested in participating in NRCS conservation programs that NRCS would require a wetland assessment.

5. Comment: I looked at your conceptual plan for converting the Tall Chief golf course to farmland. It appears to me to be an isolated property with difficult logistics for farming equipment. In addition, I know there are elk and deer in the area and there should be concerns about wildlife eating the crops. At the same time, there are sloughs and remnant wetlands. Is restoration to fish and wildlife habitat an option? I think the site would qualify for federal wetland restoration funds.

Answer: The parcel is located adjacent to the Snoqualmie Agriculture Production District, and several nearby properties are longstanding commercial farms. The intent of the RFP is to return this parcel to agricultural production and maximize the economic benefit of the portion not in the floodplain for value-added or other agricultural support activities. With that said, it

is King County's intent that the forested upland, wetlands, and other natural resource areas on the parcel be protected.

6. Comment: 190 acres is a lot for one entity to take on. Would the County consider a proposal to buy or lease a portion of the property rather than the whole thing? (The RFP refers to buyer(s) and tenant(s), but it's unclear as to whether it's referring to a group such as a partnership, corporation, etc., buying/leasing the entire property or if it's saying that separate individuals could buy/lease portions of it.)

Answer: King County is considering all options in response to this RFP, so proposers are welcome to submit a proposal to purchase or lease a portion of the parcel. Depending on the type and range of responses King County receives, we may negotiate final agreements with more than one proposer.

7. Comment: Would the County consider selling the farmland and infrastructure area separate from the wooded hillside? (i.e., would the County require that an entity buy all of the farmland or all of the hillside, but not require them to buy both?)

Answer: See Response to #6. Our preference is that the forested upland is managed as part of the larger farm enterprise. Because it will be isolated from other County property and have limited access, King County does not want to retain the forested upland portion of the property. However, we would consider a proposal for management of the forested area alone, and determine if it can be matched with other proposals for the rest of the property.

8. Comment: How long has it been since the property was used as a golf course? (Does the soil still contain pesticides?)

Answer: The golf course discontinued operation in January 2012. We were told that the on-site manager said that they applied a mold inhibitor on the greens and a weed-n-feed on the fairways only and that nothing was applied after operations ceased. We have done no soil testing for any chemical residue.

9. Comment: Does the hillside have any harvestable timber? Other than obtaining the necessary permit(s), would there be other constraints on harvesting it?

Answer: King County has not conducted an inventory of the forested area of the parcel, and we cannot provide proposers with an estimate of the value of the harvestable timber on that portion of parcel. However, proposers are welcome to conduct a site assessment as part of their due diligence.

The successful proposer will be required to develop a Forest Stewardship Plan, to be approved by King County. Any forest management or timber harvest must be consistent with that plan and state Forest Practices regulations. Also see answer to Question # 11.

10. Comment: Will the buyer/lessee be required to get a management plan for the wooded hillside?

Answer: See response to Question 9.

11. Comment: Is the hillside stable? (Not sure if you want to include this, but after the Oso landslide interested parties might ask.) Where could someone get more information about the stability of the hillside?

Answer: The Washington DNR landslide mapping shows the slopes as having high or moderate slope stability concerns. The county forester will ensure that the forest stewardship plan incorporates this information and it will affect what kind of management actions that will be included in the plan. Other information can be found in the geo-technical report that was prepared as part of subdivision planning by the former owners. We will make that available on the RFP webpage. Furthermore, the county is revising its landslide hazard mapping, including an assessment using LIDAR imagery. That information should be available by the time a forest stewardship plan is developed for the site.

12. Comment: Will the property be under an agricultural easement if it is leased, or only if it is sold?

Answer: Property will be under an agricultural easement only if sold.

13. Comment: Page 6, paragraph on proposed lease rates: I suggest saying that the proposed lease rate must be comparable to the lease rate for similar properties in the area so that prospective tenants do not assume that they can get a bargain rate. You might also want to ask prospective tenants to provide information that supports the rate they are requesting so that staff do not have to do this.

Answer: Proposed lease rates submitted by proposers should be based on fair market value, possibly adjusted for planned improvements to the property.

14. Comment: When the property is rezoned to A-35 do you also plan to change any of the parcel boundaries? Would the County consider changing the parcel configuration if that would be advantageous for the buyer/tenant? (I assume that this would be at the buyer/tenant's expense).

Answer: King County is considering all options in response to this RFP, so proposers are welcome to submit a proposal that includes adjustment of the parcel boundaries, within what is allowed by zoning.

15. Comment: The last paragraph on page 3 seems out of place to me. I suggest putting it at the beginning of Section 1 and adjusting the last sentence slightly as follows: The King County Department of Natural Resources and Parks purchased this property in 2013 to prevent the subdivision of the parcel(s), development of a housing subdivision, and loss of prime agricultural acreage on the boundary of the Snoqualmie APD, and further to create an opportunity for use of the site resources to increase and support farming in the valley. King County considers that offering the property for sale in fee or for lease is the best way to meet the goals for the property put forth in Section 1 below: (then list the goals of the RFP.

Answer: Thank you for this comment – RFP is adjusted accordingly.

16. Comment: At the meeting I asked if any phase one feasibility study had taken place prior to developing the RFP. I believe it would be useful if the County would consider such a study to ensure the best possible proposals are considered. I also believe something along the lines of an economic program study that considers use compatibility should be considered.

Answer: We have no plans to conduct a feasibility study for the Tall Chief parcel. We believe that the RFP as drafted allows proposers maximum flexibility to propose a wide range of uses for the parcel that will maximize the economic potential of the parcel. While conducting an economic development potential analysis of the parcel might yield some benefit to proposers, we believe that the added increment of benefit is offset by delay in issuing the RFP and returning the parcel to agricultural production.

17. Comment: In regards to the Proposed Evaluation and Selection Criteria. I believe it would be beneficial to require applicants to commit to certifications such as being certified organic or Salmon Safe certified as one way to help ensure sustainable practices on the land.

Answer: We have added a requirement that proposers submit a stewardship plan for the property, indicating how they will protect or restore natural resources on the site. We will evaluate proposals based on the commitment to sustainability practices on the parcel. Entering into resource management or environmental certification programs, such as Salmon Safe, is one way to demonstrate that commitment, but it will not be required.

18. Comment: Provide formal planning/economic development consultation prior making a decision.

Answer: The intent of this comment/question was not clear to the project team.

19. Comment: Overall, I would like to see stronger sustainability criteria associated with the RFP.

Answer: See response to #17.

20. Comment: Are there any measures to ensure the tenant or tenants provide valley wide benefits from their operation(s)?

Answer: We have changed the evaluation criteria to clarify that we are awarding points based on the degree to which the proposal utilizes the upland areas, existing structures, or redeveloped/new structures to provide regional processing, value added, or other farm related functions that are of a valley-wide or regional benefit.

21. Comment: What exactly are you looking for in the Financial Capability section? What question are you trying to answer? Are you looking for past experience that demonstrates an ability to do the things that are proposed? Or for documentation of current financial health? It is not immediately clear what the objective of the question is.

Answer: Proposals should demonstrate the proposer's experience and identify the team of individuals who will be carrying out the project and describe their experience operating agricultural enterprises that qualify them to carry out the scope of work detailed in the proposal.

The proposal should also include evidence of financial wherewithal to complete the work delineated in the proposal, which could include letters of commitment from banks or other lending entities, audit reports showing financial condition of non-profits, or for private entities a financial disclosure statement.

22. Comment: I'm assuming that you do not want the Business Plan to be a re-statement of what will come later in the proposal, is that right? Do you have an idea of how many pages you want the Business Plan to be? Are you just looking for something like an Executive Summary, or do you want something more extensive? It seems to me that the entire proposal could be thought of as a proposers' Business Plan.

Answer: The Business Plan should not be a re-statement of the rest of the proposal. It should demonstrate how the proposal will be successful economically for the long term. This should include identification of start-up and ongoing operating costs, markets, expected revenues, etc.

23. Comment: In the Lease Proposals section, the RFP asks for a financing plan under both the Buildings section, and the Land section. Could we provide one comprehensive financing plan instead?

Answer: We have revised the language to ask for a financing plan only once.

24. Comment: And finally, while we are looking forward to putting in the work to bring our various partners together to write this proposal, we are worried that the timing may prove difficult. Several key members of our proposal team have planned time-off in August and September, and given the complexity of this project and the number of partners to coordinate with, that may impact the quality of work we are able to provide. Would you consider moving the due date back to October 15th? Would that give you enough time to review proposals, select a finalist and complete negotiations before the New Year?

Answer: We are extending the proposal submission date to mid October, 2014.

25. Comment: What level of detail you are interested in for the maps/ drawings to illustrate proposed land use plans. Are you thinking architectural renderings, or google maps with plots delineated?

Answer: A map illustrating plans for crops and any new structures/site improvements is not required, but would be helpful to the project team in reviewing the proposal. Locations do not have to be precise, but should indicate the general location of areas to be farmed and location/size of new structures. Architectural renderings are not necessary, but the more detail that proposers can provide, the better equipped the project team will be to make a decision.

26. Comment: Overall, we support the spirit of the of evaluation criteria, including the weighting. However, the category titled “use of existing infrastructure” is expressed in a way that is somewhat confusing and possibly misleading. The spirit of this objective – maximizing infrastructure to benefit to the greater agricultural community of the Snoqualmie Valley, especially in regards to value-added functions – is the salient point. Whether this is achieved through renovation of existing buildings or investment in replacement structures should be up to the entity making the proposal. We would rather see points awarded for likelihood of achieving the results as opposed to for the method itself. Perhaps this can be addressed by requesting a narrative of plans for the buildings and infrastructure to satisfy the overall goals for the project.

Answer: We agree with this comment, and have changed the wording of the evaluation criteria to reflect that we are not encouraging or requiring proposers to retain the existing structures. We are interested in seeing if proposers believe that the existing structures can be rehabilitated, but our interest in the evaluation criteria is primarily ensuring that the use of the upland areas is maximized to benefit the proposer and potentially the broader agricultural economy in the Snoqualmie Valley and the region.

27. Comment: Another comment on this section is that the community aspect contained in the second and third points under the "Educational/Tourism Opportunities" section should be featured prominently, perhaps as part of the first, main section (Land Use/Sustainable Ag).

Answer: We have added community benefit prominently in the evaluation section on use of existing (or new) infrastructure.

28. Comment: The County purchased three tax parcels. The purchaser(s) should have the right to construct three residences and potentially create three separate farms. Currently, the parcel configuration is not conducive for three residences; however, a boundary line adjustment would solve that issue. Many of the local farms have mentoring (intern) programs. A current problem is that there are few to none opportunities for these young individuals to own their own farm. Some very successful small farms in the Snoqualmie Valley (10-15ac) are providing full time incomes for 2-3 individuals and part-time incomes for an additional 2-3 individuals. This property is unique in that it has high ground. This should not be overlooked in terms of the future of farming in the Snoqualmie Valley.

Answer: The County would consider a proposal to have three residences on the property, and/or to have a boundary line adjustment that would allow for three separate farms.

29. Comment: The size of the square footage of any new potential residence should not be restricted beyond what is allowed in the zoning code. Does the 2,995sf include the garage or exclude the garage. Typically, residences in the rural zone allow for an accessory dwelling unit (ADU). Why is this being eliminated? The proposed restriction would appear to eliminate the potential for an owner/farmer establishing a Bed & Breakfast associated with seasonal cooking classes. The point is that any restrictions on the property should not preclude future farming related enterprises.

Answer: The County will entertain proposals that allow for up to three reserved dwelling units but the size limit on the living space of the dwelling units will remain 2,995 sq.ft.. This is based on 150% of the average living space of residences in the County's Agriculture Production Districts. The limit on living space does not include the garage. The purpose of the house size restriction is to help retain the affordability of the property for future farmers.

One accessory dwelling unit is allowed per reserved dwelling unit, subject to the standards in King County code and as described in the sample Agricultural Conservation Easement.

In addition, Agricultural Employee Dwelling Units are allowed, subject to the standards in state and county code and as described in the sample Agricultural Conservation Easement.

30. Comment: Section 5.2 Proposed Purchase Price: This proposal needs to have three development rights with no options for one or two. How is it that the difference between one or two “development right(s)” is \$150,000? Recent going rate when purchased by the County is approximately \$25,000/Rural TDR? This section is confusing. It is recommended that this section be revised. Let the proposer decide what it is worth for them to offer for the property with the ability to have one right for a residence for each tax parcel.

Answer: It is our intention to allow the proposers to determine the number of dwelling units from one to three. The figures included in the draft were from a preliminary appraisal done on the property, with certain assumptions about restrictions of use. They were provided to inform proposers of the approximate value of the property. If we select a proposal for purchase of the property, as part of the negotiations, we will have it reappraised based on the actual proposal.

Note that there is not a going rate for the county purchase of a development right. When we purchase an easement, we have the property appraised for the difference between the value of the property with the easement restrictions and without. This varies widely depending on how developable the parcel is and the extent of the restrictions in the easement.

31. Comment: Page 4, Item 3: Please provide information related to the potential lessors/purchasers ability to access any and or all information related to the proposed subdivision. There is a Geotechnical Report, Wetland Study, Preliminary Health Approval information related to proposed Septic Systems, and a recorded easement for a secondary access at the SE portion of the site.

Answer: The webpage will have selected documents from the permit process for the Residential Plat proposal. These include the geo-technical report, the wetlands assessment and several others. Other documents are available for view at the office of the Department of Permitting and Environmental Review by contacting Erica.Sullivan@kingcounty.gov.

32. Comment: Please add the Cad Drawings provided by SVPA to the list of available information to a prospective lessor/buyer. Some prospective applicants may have the ability to use the Cad files for the preparation of their presentation.

Answer: We will add the CAD drawings to the webpage if we receive them.

33. Comment: Parcel numbers: Please include parcel identification number for all three tax parcels.

Answer: Parcel numbers are included in the RFP.

34. Comment: Maximizing farmable acres: Under current code requirements, would it be possible to increase the potential farming area of the site by decreasing the buffer areas adjacent to the

wetlands that were proposed to be set aside for the subdivision? If buffer reduction is allowed for farming related activities, then perhaps a note could be added indicating that the future owner or lessor would need to comply with current application procedures for any buffer reductions. If allowed, how much area is within the buffer area that could be placed into farming related cultivation?

Answer: We assume that the successful proposer will comply with King County code on buffer requirements for agricultural lands, but we are not specifying buffers around the wetlands as part of the RFP process. A farm management plan can provide flexibility in regulatory buffer widths.

35. Comment: The buildings were much worse than I feared and I have known that the property itself will need a lot of work to become usable ag land (and years if it is to become Organic or Salmon Safe or both). I worry that given these factors the only proposals that will even be considered are those submitted by parties that have a lot of money. This leaves out the small farmer, the new farmer (super important to the future of ag), and the local grass roots organizations and non-profits that want this property to be an all inclusive community property that serves the greater good. I would recommend a pre-RFP feasibility study of some sort be done that offers details of what it would take to run this land and rehab the buildings so that smaller groups have a glimmer of hope in competing.

Answer: We have no plans to conduct a feasibility study for the Tall Chief parcel. We believe that the RFP as drafted allows proposers maximum flexibility to propose a wide range of uses for the parcel that will maximize the economic potential of the parcel. While conducting an economic development potential analysis of the parcel might yield some benefit to proposers, we believe that the added increment of benefit is offset by delay in issuing the RFP and returning the parcel to agricultural production.

We believe that by structuring the RFP evaluation criteria to rate proposers on outcomes, we have created an environment where smaller groups and NGOs can compete with well-financed interests. The County's interest is in supporting a project that is going to be sustainable over the long-term, and provide a significant benefit to the community.

36. Comment: Sustainability isn't clearly defined in the RFP and I am assuming this means ecologically and economically. These two items are often at odds with each other and I would hope the definition is fine tuned. I would hope too, as a local citizen that eats and plays locally, that it would be in any sales deal that, at minimum the land must be run organically, preferably a more stringent certification like Salmon Safe and that any buildings be built in a progressive fashion as well (again, Salmon Safe, LEED, Living Building etc.)

Answer: We have added a requirement that proposers submit a stewardship plan for the property, indicating how they will protect or restore natural resources on the site. We will evaluate proposals based on the commitment to sustainability practices on the parcel. Entering into resource management or environmental certification programs, such as Salmon Safe, is one way to demonstrate that commitment, but it will not be required.

37. Comment: Finally, there is only a small mention of the forested area above and I would hope that this stretch too would come with its own protection and consideration. IF there is to be harvesting that it be done in the most ecologically sensitive way possible. This area would offer so much to the wilderness education community in this region, as well as the local tribes and I would like to see it mentioned as an important component OR its own separate RFP that non-ag groups could submit for.

Answer: The County intends that a condition of sale or lease would be that the proposer develop a forest stewardship plan for the upland portion of the parcel. The County Forestry Program will assist in the development of the plan. The County will consider proposals limited to just the forested section of the parcel if non-agricultural groups are interested.

38. Comment: I most heartily applaud the first stated goal to: “1) Restore and preserve the property as working farmland.” However, I’m not quite as comfortable with the second and third stated goals: “2) Create opportunities to use it as an asset for the agricultural community, and 3) Maximize the use of existing facilities on the property to support a sustainable agriculture economy in the valley.” Please don’t get me wrong, in and of themselves, these are excellent goals and ones that go hand in glove with my work serving the agricultural communities of the region. That said, I feel they may be too far-reaching for this property in this situation and thus perhaps not as appropriate.

With those last two goals added, it is almost certain that no farmer (that’s in the business of farming) will be able to write a proposal capable of meeting them while maintaining a bottom line in the black. That means the proposals most likely to be received will be those from non-profit organizations/collaborations with an eye to expanding/starting beginning farmer/intern/etc.-type programs. As a founding board member of Sno-Valley Tilth, and a member of the agricultural educational community I can certainly envision the property as a wonderful teaching facility for new farmers. However, the difference between those two type operations are stark at best.

Until such time as the larger communities of our region declare things to be different, farming is a business that must stay in the black to continue. Farmers are driven to succeed by the need to feed their families, just like the rest of us. This means they don’t voluntarily make decisions that affect their bottom line in a negative fashion. If a farmer were to purchase or lease this property under the current stated goals, based on what I read elsewhere in the document, they will have

to spend a significant portion of time, energy, and money on things that may have nothing to do with making their operation profitable.

On the other hand, if the property becomes a regional teaching facility/intern cooperative, etc. the reverse will be true. Goals 2 & 3 will be met in spades, but the goal of making it 'working (which I take to mean profitable)' farmland may not be met very well.

Answer: The intent of the RFP is to provide proposers with a variety of different avenues to achieve a high score, and the project team's perspective is that none of the goals outlined in the RFP and referenced in this comment are mutually exclusive. The RFP has been structured to solicit a range of responses that we hope will achieve multiple objectives.

39. Comment: I'd ask the county to seriously reconsider the stated goals and decide which of them is truly the most important for this property at this point in time. Much as I would love to see a farmer training facility in the valley, I really think it's more important to ensure that the farmers we currently still have around (or that might consider moving/expanding to the area) are provided with opportunities to purchase the property with minimal strings attached. I'd also ask the county to consider being much more flexible regarding splitting the property into smaller portions that might be purchased independently by several different operations. Depending on the operation, five acres may be all that is necessary for a thriving operation of intensive fruit or vegetable production.

Answer: King County is considering all options in response to this RFP, so proposers are welcome to submit a proposal to purchase or lease a portion of the parcel. Depending on the type and range of responses King County receives, we may negotiate final agreements with more than one proposer.

40. Comment: With so many forested upland acres unavailable to farming as part of the property, it leaves the land with a potential encumbrance to that ever-fragile break-even point. If some/most/all of those acres could be left out of the transaction as an option to be sold by the county for a 3-5 homes (with restrictions on deforestation of course), the rest of the property would have a much lower selling price and thus fall within the reach of real farmers, not just those with money and a desire, but not perhaps the skills.

Answer: King County is considering all options in response to this RFP, so proposers are welcome to submit a proposal to purchase or lease a portion of the parcel. Depending on the type and range of responses King County receives, we may negotiate final agreements with more than one proposer.

41. Comment: Insisting that details regarding every aspect of what happens to the all portions of the property/buildings/etc., whether there is a sublease, etc. to be spelled out in an RFP is another strike against farmers acquiring the property. Most of us would not want to sublease a portion of our farms unless it became necessary. To be forced to abide by an economic guess

made years before simply is not good business. There are a number of other detailed restrictions throughout the RFP that don't seem justified to be asking/requiring of a farmer purchasing the property, but certainly would be of an educational collaborative.

Answer: We have removed the requirement for a purchase proposal to include information on plans to lease the property. The intent is to make clear to proposers the types of information King County will require to make an informed choice between proposers. Proposers can decide the degree to which they are able or willing to provide the information requested. The project team appreciates the issues/limitations outlined in this comment, and we would encourage proposers to provide as much information as they reasonably can.

42. Comment: However, there's a complete lack of restrictions on what can happen on the property if the easement allows for "Open Space" uses and does not specifically spell out what is meant by agriculture. Time and again we have all witnessed preserved farmland having anything but real agricultural production happening. We simply cannot allow any more properties to become horse farms until such time as we decide that horses are a protein resource similar to beef or pork. Probably too many legal holes in it, but for me, agriculture has always meant crops that meet the definition of being either food, forage, or fiber...period.

Answer: If this procurement results in a sale of the property, we will work with the winning proposer to structure an easement that provides the County with as much surety, as is reasonably possible, that the property will remain in market agricultural production. However, there are legal and practical limitations on what can be required of a property owner through any easement. Consequently, in the case of a sale or lease we will be evaluating the experience and financial wherewithal of proposers to execute the vision they outline in their RFP.